

MINUTES – MAY 7, 2012

The Caswell County Board of Commissioners met in regular session at the Historic Courthouse in Yanceyville, North Carolina at 6:30 p.m. on Monday, May 7, 2012. Members present: Nathaniel Hall, Chairman, Cathy W. Lucas, Vice-Chair, William E. Carter, Jeremiah Jefferies, Gordon G. Satterfield, Kenneth D. Travis and N. Kent Williamson. Also present: Kevin B. Howard, County Manager, Brian Ferrell, County Attorney, and Angela Evans representing The Caswell Messenger. Paula P. Seamster, Clerk to the Board, recorded the minutes.

MOMENT OF SILENT PRAYER

Chairman Hall opened the meeting with a Moment of Silent Prayer.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chairman Hall asked the Board of Commissioners and the citizens present to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to approve the agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

APPROVAL OF CONSENT AGENDA

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to approve the Consent Agenda. The motion carried unanimously.

The following items were included on the Consent Agenda:

- A) Approval of Minutes of April 9, 2012 Special Meeting
- B) Approval of Minutes of April 16, 2012 Regular Meeting
- C) Approval of Minutes of April 24, 2012 Special Meeting

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Chairman Hall opened the floor for public comments.

With no public comments Chairman Hall declared Public Comments to be closed.

COUNTY DAY PRESENTATION

Clerk to the Board showed a slide presentation on County Day which was held on April 21, 2012.

Ms. Seamster stated that County Day was a day that the citizens of Caswell County could come and ask what the different county departments could offer them as citizens.

Chairman Hall stated “We wanted to do that because the departments did an excellent job preparing for County Day. All of the departments were represented and like Ms. Seamster said a lot of us learned quite a few new things and I was one of them. I learned something about Social Services. I learned something about Farmer Lake and I learned something about the Register of Deeds and I have been around for a while. I think we have citizens out there that may not know the services that we provide and that was the emphasis behind doing this. We will do it again the participation was not as good as we had hoped. I would like to commend the departments for a job well done and I would like to thank them for all their hard work.”

BOARD OF EQUALIZATION AND REVIEW

Commissioner Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to convene as the Board of Equalization and Review. The motion carried unanimously.

Ms. Paula Seamster, Clerk to the Board, administered the following Oaths of Office to the Caswell County Board of Equalization and Review.

Oath of Office Caswell County Board of Equalization and Review

I do solemnly swear that I will support and maintain the Constitution and laws of the United States, and the Constitution and laws of North Carolina not inconsistent therewith, and I will faithfully discharge the duties of my office as a member of the Board of Equalization and Review, so help me God; and that I will not allow my actions as a member of the Board of Equalization and Review to be influenced by personal or political friendships or obligations.

S/Nathaniel Hall
Nathaniel Hall

S/ Cathy W. Lucas
Cathy W. Lucas

S/William E. Carter
William E. Carter

S/Jeremiah Jefferies
Jeremiah Jefferies

S/Gordon G. Satterfield
Gordon G. Satterfield

S/Kenneth D. Travis
Kenneth D. Travis

N. Kent Williamson
N. Kent Williamson

Subscribed and sworn to
before me this 7th day
of May, 2012.

S/Paula P. Seamster
Paula P. Seamster

Clerk to the Board
Title

Mr. Thomas Bernard, Tax Director, stated “Gentlemen I have no one on the agenda tonight. I don’t know if there is anyone in the audience but I do not have anyone on the agenda for tonight. There may be someone on the agenda for the next meeting.”

Chairman Hall asked “We do not have anyone on the agenda for the Board of Equalization and Review is there anyone present who would like to get on the agenda?”

Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Williamson to recess the Board of Equalization and Review until the next meeting on May 21, 2012 at 6:30 p.m. The motion carried unanimously.

PBH GOVERNANCE JOINT RESOLUTION

Mr. Steve Tomlinson came before the Board and made the following statement:

“Good evening Commissioners. My name is Steve Tomlinson and I am the chief operating officer at Piedmont Behavioral Healthcare also known as PBH and I am here to respectfully request that you gentleman approve the joint resolution for governance for the PBH board. May I first tell you a little bit about myself and certainly about PBH. I have been with PBH for 15 years as a clinician and as an emergency services manager. The time I have been with PBH, PBH covered Cabarrus, Stanley, Union, Rowan and Davidson Counties. PBH has been a pilot program since 2003 wherein we began to operate the Medicaid waiver which is a waiver from the Social Security Act regulations governing the method by which Medicaid services are under and authorized. PBH has been operating the waiver for the past 7 years as a pilot program and PBH has successfully managed the Medicaid dollars coming into our catchment area so much so that the Division of Mental Health in reviewing how PBH has been performing as a pilot program managing the waiver decided to expand the waiver across the state of North Carolina and has identified 10 additional waiver sites. Many of you know that this past October PBH merged and partnered with Alamance/Caswell Area Mental Health Authority in its effort to expand the operation of the Medicaid waiver to the Alamance/Caswell area. Significantly so we have been meeting with board members of the Alamance/Caswell Area Mental Health Authority as well as members of the Area Mental Health Authority known as PBH and we have recently

also partnered with Five Counties Area Mental Health Authority and Orange/Person/Chatham to make a combined total of 15 counties that we will management the Medicaid waiver from. One of the significant things that I would like to bring to the Board's attention and I know that you have probably already heard with the expansion of healthcare reform in 2014 there will be a significantly larger number of individuals that will be eligible for Medicaid funded services. In looking at the number of dollars we anticipate coming into the Caswell area they will be significant. I would like to say that if you wore a 2X t-shirt it would be like going from a 2X to a 3X in terms of the number of individuals that will be able to utilize Medicaid services.

(At 6:50 p.m. Commissioner Lucas entered the meeting).

Mr. Tomlinson continued "Significantly for the state of North Carolina the Division of Mental Health appropriates approximately \$6 million into the Caswell area for the provision of mental health, developmental disabilities and substance abuse services. In addition to that Medicaid brings in roughly \$30 million into this area. So using that same formula you could anticipate close to a gross of forty plus million dollars of services for individuals needing mental health intellectual and developmental disability services and substance abuse services as well. We believe that we have been very successful in managing the Medicaid waiver by attracting qualified providers to come into our areas because they know that we operate a network that attracts the highest quality of individuals in that area and each area that we have partnered with has benefited by having increased capacity and increased services to be able to be provided to this area. Now with that said the governance legislation is a legislations that is really designed to in addition to having a local area boards that will govern how the services are managed, the number of providers that are offering services into the area and manage the dollars that will be appropriated in the Caswell area that each respective local management entity. That would be PBH. That would be Alamance/Caswell. That would be OPC and that would be Five Counties would have their own respective board as they do right now but obviously the number of individuals that would sit at a table at a board meeting would be very, very large and so what we wanted was in this governance legislation was to introduce a concept where we would have an area governing board that would be established from the local boards. Those individuals that serve on the local boards would be able to appoint individuals to the governance board. Including in that group would be county commissioners that have been designated by each of the respective local boards and the governing legislation is really designed to address that. We would really like to offer this as an opportunity to manage the system better to be able to provide more services with an increased number of providers coming into the Caswell area. I have personally been to the Caswell Area Mental Health building and was given a tour of that facility and we do know that we have providers that are currently providing services in that facility. That facility has significantly more capacity than what we currently have in terms of providers capabilities but what we want to do is we want to do some refurbishing of that area and also to encourage providers to be able to come and offer the services that they know they have been successfully offering in other parts of our system and to offer those services in the Caswell County Mental Health Authority Area. We are wanting really to have an opportunity to have a more Medicaid dollars being brought into the area and we know that as of 2014 there will be more individuals that will be enrolled in Medicaid that is to say that more individuals will need to have services and more providers that will be needing to provide those services and we feel that if we were to be successful in establishing and overarching a governing board we would be

able to manage the system better and to attract better quality of providers into this community. I wanted to come to you and talk to you about that and to tell you that I am here with Debra Welch. She is currently the Community Operations Center Director formerly the Area Authority. The director for PBH and certainly now with me now is Reid Thornburg which represents our provider network. He is responsible for encouraging providers to come into the area. I have two of our board members: Ethel Gwynn and Ethel Fuller also here in attendance with me this evening to really show support for what we hope will be the passage of our joint resolution if the Board would deem that to be the case.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Where does the name Cardinal Innovations come from?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Cardinal Innovations was a concept that was created as a result of the creation of our Cardinal Innovation software many years ago. PBH was the developer of the software that is used currently to manage the vast number of records that we currently retain on individuals that receive mental health intellectual and developmental disability services. The thinking was that the Board would want to have Cardinal Innovations being the new name for PBH moving into the next fiscal year.” Commissioner Lucas continued “So is it actually a software company?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “No it is not.” Commissioner Lucas asked “So it is based on the program?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Yes it is based on the program.” Commissioner Lucas continued “Have the other entities signed on to what you are proposing?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Yes of the 15 counties 13 counties have already signed on to support the resolution and we are anticipating that these 2 will as well.” Commissioner Lucas asked “The Board was provided a listing of the providers, are they currently in place now?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Yes they are.” Commissioner Lucas continued “And they have been in place for some time?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Yes they have. We asked for the network development department to review all of those providers that they currently are paying claims for services that are being made available in that area and those were the list of providers that were compiled.” Commissioner Lucas asked “And these numbers are based solely on Caswell County, is that correct?” Ms. Debra Welch responded “Yes. Commissioner Lucas in your packet there is also a colorful graph that shows providers for both counties. They may not be housed here in Caswell County but they do provide services here in the county.” Commissioner Lucas continued “So this page is being broken down for services just for Caswell County?” Mr. Thornburg responded “Those are the persons that are on Medicaid.” Commissioner Lucas asked “Are these numbers specific to Caswell County on this paper here?” Mr. Thornburg responded “There are 7 providers in Caswell County.” Commissioner Lucas asked “The services that have been provided since when?” Ms. Welch responded “Since October 1, 2011.” Commissioner Lucas continued “So these have been since they have been active, the providers?” Ms. Welch responded “Yes.” Mr. Tomlinson stated “As of October 1st all of the providers that agreed to provide services in this area had to be enrolled in the PBH provider network and contract with PBH for the provision of Medicaid services. Prior to October 1st those services were provided under Value Options and so the providers of Medicaid services have gone through Value Options in order to provide those services. PBH as a managed behavioral healthcare company is now operating the management of the Medicaid services in that area and that would mean that all providers that were interested in billing Medicaid would be required to contract us in order to bill for those services.”

Commissioner Jefferies asked "I just have a few questions. I know when we were down at the meeting April and the question was asked if the commissioners would be cut off and in what I am reading here it states that all the commissioners would be cut out but 2 and those 2 will be picked by the board. We were not told this when we were down there and this question was asked. This was not stated this way but once I read this over the weekend that is when I found this out and you are also going to cut some board members out as well. These questions were asked and we were told no. I can't understand why we were not told this when we were at the meeting in April." Mr. Tomlinson responded "The plan is to have each of the local boards that would appoint individuals to the governing board. Those appointees would serve on that governing board and that there may be as many county commissioners or there may not be as many members of the board as currently it is now but those would be representatives of the local boards. Alamance/Caswell will have their local governing board and they will appoint individuals to the overarching board." Commissioner Jefferies continued "So my understanding is that we will not be down in Charlotte but we will have a local board here that we will be serving on?" Mr. Tomlinson responded "Yes that is correct and from that board you will appoint individuals to serve on the governing board." Commissioner Jefferies asked "My understanding from the meeting was different so things have changed right?" Mr. Tomlinson responded "No, I do believe that this has always been the intent that the local boards would continue to operate and they would continue to perform the services that they have been performing but that they would appoint individuals to the governing board which would meet regularly to discuss items that would be necessary."

Chairman Hall stated "The governing policy that I read there is a governing board and the local board, based on what we have, are advisory boards. They have no policy making power. It says that 2 commissioners will be appointed to the governing board and they will be decided upon by the current board. So that is 2 out of 15 counties which in effect takes the commissioners out of the decision making realm. Now in your open comments you talked about over \$40 million to serve our community and as elected officials I am thinking that we should have some say so on how that \$40 million is going to be spent but this document does not give us that. What the documents says is that we will have an advisory board and then the governing board will determine what commissioners will serve. So basically there will be 2 commissioners chosen from 2 other counties and we are out of the decision making process, is that not correct?" Mr. Tomlinson responded "Obviously I would be concerned as commissioners in regard to having say with regard to state and federal dollars spent in Caswell County area and I would say that the process by which PBH does allocate funds for the purposes of providing services in the community is a very collaborative process and it does involve individuals who are in attendance. The members who are seated here would be members of the local board as well as the executive leadership team of the operating center. In fact, currently we are in the process of reviewing our current budget for the next fiscal year and Debra Welch and her executive team has been working very diligently to identify resources and the number of dollars that should be appropriated for various services that will be offered in the Caswell County area. That is the process we have followed in the past and it has been very successful." Ms. Welch added "Before when we were Alamance/Caswell LME the board was chosen by population. The new governing board offers equal representation. Each county has 3 advisory members so you really get more representation. The advisory board will work in concert with the governing board. Their votes go to the governing board. The 2 commissioner are at large and they will rotate off."

It may be a commissioner from Caswell and Halifax and those will revolve off on rotating basis. Everybody on the board will have a say. I want you to know that we want everyone to have a say.” Chairman Hall continued “I understand. Thank you. I am just referring to the document. In the document the local boards is an advisory board and it says they will monitor, monitor, monitor and that is part of my concern. I guess PBH is considered an LME.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Yes it is.” Chairman Hall asked “And LMEs are established by statutes?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “122c.” Chairman Hall continued “At this point have you been approved for this transition?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “No, not at this time.” Chairman Hall stated “Current statute gives us commissioners certain positions on the board. So what you are suggesting in this policy is that we give up that right to serve on the board.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “No, we want to have county representatives.” Chairman Hall continued “I am talking about county commissioners. You will only have 2 out of 15 counties. You are asking them to give up their rights because they have to give up their rights to serve on this board. Again that is part of my concern.”

Mr. Ferrell stated “Mr. Chairman there are some legal consequences in the resolution that I would like to make the board aware of if that is appropriate. As I was looking through the resolution I just wanted to make the board aware that it essentially does 3 things. The 3 things are highlighted in the resolution itself. The first thing it does is it apparently creates a new LME authority. The second is that it modifies the existing governance structure of PBH so that the new authority would have the structure Mr. Tomlinson has mentioned here today. It also establishes powers and duties of the authority as well in this resolution so it is a multifaceted resolution. I see the resolution as a function of growing pains. As we all have been aware of in the last year consolidation of LMEs across the state has lead to some issues with the way the current statutes read. Governance is one of those topics that as the consolidations has occurred has gotten a look from the legislature and other about how these new larger bigger larger budget based organizations are going to function. The legislature right now in fact there is a subcommittee on LME governance that has been meeting since the first of the year. They are dealing with this issue on how to come up with a system on board representation for these new larger LMEs that works for everyone. A board with 30 county commissioners when you have nobody engaged with the direct LME business could be problematic, let’s just face it. This subcommittee with the legislature right now is meeting. In fact they have another meeting I believe it will be their third meeting on Monday and their charge is to recommend to the General Assembly statutory changes to the current scheme of the LME governance. They are looking at a lot of the same issues that are embedded in this resolution about feeder boards if you will, local representation boards, how many commissioners should sit, what other kinds of professionals does it make sense to have on these boards. They are looking at all of these issues. This subcommittee, I have not been to their meetings but I have read their meeting minutes however is going to be responsible to make recommended legislative changes to deal with a lot of the issues that are contained in the resolution. I would like to know the role that PBH is playing in the subcommittee and how that process is working out because the legislation will essentially be a system wide, not just PBH but system wide legislative changes but that committee’s work is not done yet. They have not gotten to the point of codifying their work and so I would like to hear from Mr. Tomlinson about the PBH work on that subcommittee.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “We are currently serving on that committee and also a participant with the other 10 mental health authorities or local management entities that will be rolling out the waiver and

discussing different opportunities and options that will offer representation on the board as well as representation locally for the purposes of making decisions about how the Medicaid service dollars as well as the state service dollars will be appropriated. Obviously a 15 member board is a large board and if you added to that 2 or 3 representatives per county for PBH you could have a representative board that would be 48 people all coming together and it would be difficult for that. We also know that there are other local management entities that have a much larger number of counties than PBH does and they are actually examining what would be a feasible way for them to be able to have adequate representation at each level. At the local level where decisions should most definitely be made about the appropriation of state and local dollars but also be on that what would be the appropriate decision making that should happen on overarching level at the governing board that would be composed.” Mr. Ferrell continued “And that is consistent with what I have read in the work of the subcommittee. My question would be given that PBH is engaged with that subcommittee effort and that this is looking at statewide holistic changes to LME governance statewide why come with a set of recommendations in advance to the subcommittee’s work when they are looking at this again holistically with all the stakeholders involved. Why not wait until they have acted?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “We have been the pilot program for seven years and have demonstrated a proven track record in terms of being able to manage the Medicaid waiver. In terms of being able to achieve cost savings in terms of managing the not only state dollars but the Medicaid dollars. We have a close relationship with the Division of Medical Assistance that oversees Medicaid appropriations and Medicaid regulations as well as the mental health intellectual and developmental disabilities division. We are thought of as a lead LME for that purpose. We are once again leading in this endeavor as well and so we believe that by presenting to you we are offering an opportunity to be able to once again to lead the state in terms of the establishment of local boards that have a very meaningful contribution in terms of by and which state and local dollars are spent but also to develop a larger more overarching governing board that can make policy decisions at that level. That would be a way to demonstrate to the state once again that we could pilot a successful program.” Mr. Ferrell stated “That is as to the governance piece but as for the establishment of the new authority the legal question I had was what happens to PBH? Is it going to dissolve?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “PBH will become Cardinal Innovations Healthcare.” Mr. Ferrell continued “Is it literally a name change like you would file doing business as a business name change. So PBH will now be doing business as Cardinal. So there is no dissolution of PBH, is that correct? I was just a little confused because here were some materials in the agenda packet that contemplated a dissolution and resolution to be presented I guess to the county subsequent to this creation of the new authority. I was just confused.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “There will be a dissolution of the area authorities that will not be with PBH so in the case of Alamance/Caswell there would be a dissolution of Alamance/Caswell. There would be a dissolution of OPC and a dissolution of Five Counties.” Mr. Ferrell stated “I understand that. We are knee deep in that dissolution right now and that is why I had a concern if we were going to do this all again with PBH and it does not sound like that is the case. One other legal issue that I had with the establishment of the new powers and duties is the one that allowed the successor LME to make investments in private companies essentially so to the extent that you did not have readily a need for ready cash if you will, I think that is a loose recitation of how it is worded in the resolution. Cardinal would be able to invest in private companies. You have to have statutory authority to take public dollars, if you will, and invest it in private companies. I understand that this is something that has been brought forth in this LME governance

subcommittee. I don't know if there has been a resolution but that question has been presented and discussed in that committee. Any information you have about that I would appreciate. I just have a question about this board exceeding its authority to enable this entity to make private investments of public dollars." Mr. Tomlinson responded "That would only be permissible under a revision of the statute 122c that would permit that to occur. That would not be able to occur without that." Mr. Ferrell stated "I guess holistically because of these changes that are occurring and because there is legislation being recommended and maybe considered it seems to me that the resolution gets out front in several respects of current law."

Commissioner Satterfield asked "Mr. Tomlinson tell me the other 13 counties that are involved in this, how long have they been involved with PBH?" Mr. Tomlinson responded "PBH was a five county area mental health authority as of 2004. We began to partner with Alamance/Caswell, Five Counties and OPC on October 1st, January 1st and this part April 1st. Prior to that we were a five county area authority." Commissioner Satterfield continued "You talked about a total of 15 counties now. The 5 counties that have operated since 2004 are they operating under these same guidelines as far as having a local are board and having a community oversight board or is all of this new?" Mr. Tomlinson responded "All of this is new. We operated pretty much the same as Alamance/Caswell. All the other area authorities had a board. Their board in fact was a governing board. It was a board specific to that area in mental health authority. Many of you know that regionally there were approximately 40+ local management entities as of 2004 that were created under the blueprint for change and the system transformation that took place at that time. There has been a systematic pairing down of area authorities or local management entities to the current number that we have now. We will be as of July 1, 2013 eleven mental health authorities all of which will operate this way." Commissioner Satterfield asked "How many of the 15 counties have signed the resolution as of tonight?" Mr. Tomlinson responded "13."

Commissioner Lucas asked "Mr. Tomlinson and Attorney Ferrell the question he addressed has already been addressed by the legislation is that not correct?" Mr. Ferrell responded "That is not correct." Commissioner Lucas continued "That has to be addressed by statute." Mr. Tomlinson responded "Yes that is correct." Commissioner Lucas asked "Has there been a resolution for that?" Mr. Ferrell responded "No ma'am, to my knowledge that issue is on the table. There has been no resolution for that issue." Commissioner Lucas continued "Has it been resolved?" Mr. Tomlinson responded "It has not been resolved." Commissioner Lucas asked "Do we have local legislative representation on the subcommittee?" Mr. Ferrell responded "I can read off the list of attendees of the first meeting, January 24th meeting of the LME governance subcommittee was Representative Nelson Dollar who is the chair. Mark Botts from the School of Government. Representative William Brisson, David Bullins, Robert Carruth, Connie Cochran, Laurie Coker, Yvonne Copeland, Johnnie Ray Farmer, Dr. Craigan Gray, Senator Fletcher Hartsell, Bob Hendrick, Representative Pat Hurley, Steve Jordan, Dr. Beth Melcher, Foster Norman, Holly Riddle, Ramon Rojano, Pam Shipman, Gordon Simmons, Rebecca Troutman, Senator Tommy Tucker, Rosemary Weaver, Senator Louise Pate, Representative Verla Insko from Orange County." Commissioner Lucas continued "So the answer is no." Mr. Ferrell responded "No. There is a big cross section. I think the point is there is a big cross section of people working on this governance subcommittee as represented by that list. While there is no direct representative from Caswell County, there is a cross section of the state represented."

Chairman Hall asked “For those three items listed in the governance plan are you anticipating the legislation study is going to support all of this?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Yes.” Chairman Hall continued “Based on?” Mr. Tomlinson responded “Based on discussions that are coming out of this subcommittee. Based upon discussions that are being held in various quarters in regards to other local management entities and their desire to have a governance legislation.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “Again why is it important to pass this prior to the conclusion of the legislative committee.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “We anticipate being the pilot for this and being the entity that will be able to demonstrate how this works as we have in the other areas.”

Commissioner Jefferies asked “We were down there, Ms. Fuller and I and we asked these specific questions and you gave a different answer and when I got the agenda package the information changed. I am not real comfortable with this now after the change because we asked these questions. Now things have changed. Someone knew about these changes because it has not been but a month ago, the 15th of April, so someone had to know these changes then. I don’t feel comfortable with this now.”

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to table the governance resolution until more information is received.

Commissioner Lucas asked “Commissioner Jefferies what specific changes are you talking about?” Commissioner Jefferies responded “The question was asked if they were going to cut the size of the board and we were told no but when I received my agenda they are going to cut members. The 2 commissioners will be appointed by their board, PBH. This right now, I don’t feel comfortable with it. Does that answer your question?” Commissioner Lucas responded “Yes.”

Ms. Ethel Fuller stated that there are 15 counties with PBH and 13 of the counties have already signed the resolution. She stated that Caswell County would receive more money. Ms. Fuller asked what would happen to Caswell County if the county did not sign the resolution. She also asked how it could hurt Caswell County by signing the resolution. She also stated that she felt that Caswell was responsible for providing mental health services to the citizens of the county. She stated that Caswell County would receive more money than it has ever received for mental health. Mr. Tomlinson responded “There is no harm from my perspective as the chief operating officer for PBH to approve this joint dissolution because it does offer the representation that you seek in terms of local management. If you can remember when the legislative oversight committee was established, it was established to ensure that there will be a local presence, that there would be local decision making in regard to how state and federal dollars would be appropriated and utilized. As PBH has been utilizing the model for the Medicaid waiver that we have been managing successfully a very lucrative and a very quality driven provider network that provides services that we I believe could be a great benefit in this area. That was the purpose for which the Alamance/Caswell and PBH began discussions about joint partnership and joint resolution. This is the next step in that process.”

Ms. Fuller stated that her second question was if Caswell County was going to receive more money and more services then what is the reason for prolonging the decision when the county knows that the services are needed for the citizens.” Chairman Hall responded “I will take a shot at it. The services past and future were required by somebody to be provided to this county. The commissioners had a role in that decision making process. The problem I have even with looking at thirty or forty million dollars is certainly there should be more services I don’t think anyone doubts the capability for PBH to deliver what it says there is no doubt in my mind at all. What is on my mind is being elected as a representative of the citizens of Caswell is that we lose input into the process. The size of the board to me personally is not a problem. I serve on the Piedmont Triad Council of Government. We serve about 12 counties and about 50 or 60 municipalities and it is a huge board but we get the things done we are elected to do. I am a little concerned about the commissioners being taken out number one and the things our counsel mentioned that many of these things they are proposing have not been approved by the legislature yet. I am not necessarily a follower that the last 12 or 13 other counties have approved. I don’t represent the citizens of the 12 or 13 other counties, just in this county. That is the position I take on this question.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “What is our alternative for services for the citizens of this county now?” Mr. Ferrell responded “Keep in mind that Caswell County is now a member of PBH which is operating under this new Medicaid waiver model. We are a member of PBH. These services that the residents spoke of just now are being provided by PBH and they will continue to be provided by PBH because Caswell County is a member of this authority now. I am a bit confused and maybe Mr. Tomlinson can clarify I don’t see that there will be any reduction in services for failure to approve this governing board legislation or any loss of Medicaid dollars because we are in part of this waiver expansion program.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “That is correct.” Commissioner Lucas continued “So are we at a point where we can decide where to allow this organization to take over those services or the county is going to make those decisions?” Mr. Ferrell asked if Commissioner Lucas could restate her question. Commissioner Lucas asked “If the county was going to take over administering this program?” Mr. Ferrell responded “Certainly not. We are already a member of PBH. We do not have the statutory authority on our own to provide these mental health services.” Commissioner Lucas continued “Initially it was an option though.” Mr. Ferrell responded “Well if you have the population catchment area. Currently well just today Wake and Durham Counties announced that they are going to partner up and form an LME. They had to have a 500,000 person catchment area to make that work. We obviously we are not in that ballpark.” Commissioner Lucas asked “They made that decision today?” Mr. Ferrell responded “Today I saw it in the paper, I don’t know when the decision was made but it was in the paper today. They meet the statutory population requirements. They can choose just like Caswell chose to go with PBH and by all accounts that is working well. Just keep in mind to the extent that part of the issue here is just a renaming. Just what we heard is partly that they want a new name. I certainly don’t think there is any consequence to this board resolving that it approves a name change if it wants to do that. The technical pieces of the governance and the technical pieces of the power and duties again that were flipped over in the legislative process.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “My I state that prior to partnering with PBH the county commissioners and local elected officials did not provide input with regard to Medicaid services or Medicaid dollars. They provided input and advise with regard to the \$6 million that was appropriated Alamance/Caswell with regard to the state

allocation for those services to be provided. This Medicaid waiver and the management of Medicaid dollars is very significant because in doing so it enables PBH to provide those services in Caswell County in a way that gets the right people the right service at the right time. With the amount of savings that is typically experience by managing Medicaid dollars to re-appropriate those dollars into the Caswell area in the provision in the new and innovative services that help people that have intellectual and developmental disabilities, mental health and substance abuse needs. This is the single most reason why the waiver has been subscribed to across the state and the model that PBH has established and had established seven years ago is going to be rolled out. Because of the demonstrated method by which we take the state dollars and we take the Medicaid dollars that are appropriated that counties typically never had any say about how those dollars would be spent and bring that into the counties so that the counties could say this is where I envision these Medicaid dollars to be. As I indicated in 2014 there is going to be a substantially larger number of individuals that will be covered by Medicaid. This is very, very significant in terms of what it is that we are being offered an opportunity to do.”

Ms. Welch stated that before Caswell County was with PBH they went through Value Option which was a private company. The county did not have to think about how the money was being appropriated and now you have a say in that. \$125,000 goes to the clinic on Wall Street which pays for the overhead. She also stated that there were no changes to the governance piece and that Ethel Gwynn and other committee members designed it. Ms. Welch stated that PBH will allow the county to provide services to the citizens that were not available before. She added that Caswell County will have more services and better people coming to the county every day. She stated that she was proud to be a member of this county and organization.

Chairman Hall stated “One final comment just for clarification. We are in this and we are a part of PBH whether or not we approve this governance plan as submitted that is not going to change what we do in Caswell County.” Mr. Tomlinson responded “In terms of the provision of services that is correct sir.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “What is the recommendation of counsel?” Mr. Ferrell responded “My recommendation would be that we see what emerges from the legislative subcommittee. It may very well be the exact same substantive changes to the laws that are proposed here and maybe have the same resolution but at least we would have legislative authority to delegate certain powers to this entity and also to have the benefit of the thinking of a collective group of folks who are looking hard at these governance issues and get their best recommendation on how an entity such as PBH should be organized and governed. That is my recommendation.” Commissioner Lucas continued “Can we be more specific about how long we are going to table this?” Mr. Ferrell responded “The minutes of the subcommittee indicated that they were to meet four times and then make recommendation for legislative changes. My reading and please correct me if anyone know better that the third meeting will be held on next Monday. I don’t know about the fourth meeting or if there will be plans for a successive meeting. I also know that during short session there may ultimately be no legislation proposed because of the nature of the short legislative session this year but at least the recommendations should be emerging fairly quickly since they are on the downhill side of their meeting count.”

Upon a vote of the motion to table the governance resolution until further information can be received, the motion carried by a vote of six to one with Commissioner Satterfield voting no.

RECESS

The Board held a brief recess.

PRESENTATION OF 2012 ASPCA BUDGET

Dr. Mitch Foster came before the Board and made the following statement:

“For those of you who don’t know me, my name is Dr. Mitch Foster. I am a local veterinarian and I also serve on the Board of Directors of the Animal Protection Society of Caswell. I would like to thank you first for this opportunity to speak to you and thank you for all the support you have given us in the past. I know that you all have a difficult task trying to provide for all the citizens of the county with our limited financial needs and I know every year everybody is requesting more funds. The first thing I want to go over more or less is what the shelter is currently doing. I think that you all have a sheet in your packets that basically shows you the euthanasia and adoption rates of our shelter. It also compares it to some of the other local shelters. To briefly summarize at the bottom of that information you can see back in 2005 we were euthanizing 77% of all the animals that came into the shelter. This past year we only euthanized 53% of all the animals. Some other things to point out unfortunately is we don’t do quite as good a job with cats in finding them homes. We are currently putting about 78% of all cats that come into the shelter to sleep. But we are only euthanizing 33% of all the dogs that come into the shelter. At the very bottom you will also notice two comparisons with Rockingham County and Person County.” Commissioner Lucas stated “We don’t have that.” Dr. Foster continued “I will try to make this available to you after the meeting or at some other time. But at the bottom it shows that Rockingham County this past year euthanized 80% of all animals that came into the shelter. Person County was a little better at 67%. The Danville Area Humane Society, there was an article in the paper going over their new shelter, they euthanized 80% of all dogs, 90% of all cats that came into the shelter. I think when you compare their 80% and 67% and 90% to our 33% it speaks volumes for the jobs that these employees are doing for this county. I think the county should be extremely proud of everything that they have done. They are truly a shining light for this county but this outstanding job does come with a price. We included the financial sheet to try to give you some idea of what our financial situation is. If you will notice back in 2008 we had a cash balance of about \$56,000 and a lot of that was due to some generous donations that came in the previous years. Skipping over quickly to 2012 in February that fund balance was down to \$19,000. Of that \$19,000, in the column of savings, the \$9,961 is actually money that is encumbered for spaying and neutering of animals. Every time someone comes in to adopt an animal they pay a fee that money has to be set aside to go to that operation to spay or neuter. This is money that may be used in the future when Ms. Jones has her cat or dog spayed or neutered and we can’t really touch that. If you take that money out we only have \$9,854 of cash reserve available to us right now. As you can see we basically have been steadily going downhill as far as our financials by about \$10,000 a year over the past 4 years. Our budget request that we have submitted to you also includes several other items. Number 1 I will say that we are currently spending about \$10,000 or more every year than we

take in. Number 2 the shelter is inspected by the North Carolina Department of Agriculture every year. We are required by law and all shelters have to be inspected to make sure they are up to code. There have been several things in the past that have been cited that we need to correct as soon as possible. 1) We have some fencing that is damaged that needs to be repaired. 2) We have to replace some rusted metal doors. All the doors in the shelter are metal framed and we use a lot of bleach to sanitize and clean with. Bleach and metal unfortunately don't mix so now they have rusted. The Department of Agriculture does not like rust so they want us to sand it down and repaint it. That is going to be a substantial cost there. The other thing that was included is money for a roof over some of the dog runs that we have outside. The other thing we included in our budget request is we are asking for help to fund a pay raise for our employees. They have not had one in five years. As a matter of fact they have actually lost money due to our financial problems we have had to cut back on the health insurance and raised our deductible so that means that they have out of pocket expenses that they did not have and we have not compensated them for that. We are asking for money to give them a pay raise. Of course to me I asked myself why we are in this situation that we are in and I know that is a good question and up until 2007 we basically had a full time volunteer shelter manager and also a volunteer bookkeeper. In 2007 those two board members resigned and since then that has left a lot of the things they were doing to be taken over by the shelter staff. We have had to hire people to work more in the back to kind of take over the slack where this person has had to move up front to handle some of those managerial duties. The staff now spends a lot more time trying to promote the shelter and the animals, taking pictures, answering phone calls, internet, we ship dogs everywhere. People from New Jersey, Pennsylvania and all over the country see dogs on our website and say I want to adopt that dog and save that dog. Like I said that is one of the benefits. What will happen if we don't have any increase in funds? This means that we will have to cut staff and by cutting staff that means that we will have to cut the number of animals we hold and how long we hold them. The state minimum right now is 72 hours and if we do that basically we will jump our euthanasia rate to 80%. This means instead of last year when we put down 319 dogs, if we jump to 80% we will have to put to sleep 831 dogs. That is over 500 more dogs a year that will have to be put to sleep without additional funding. There is no way we can do it without that. I know that the animals for this county cannot speak for themselves and it is up to us to speak for them. One of the things that I often hear as one of the comments by the great humanitarian and civil rights leader Mahatma Gandhi, he said 'the greatness of a nation and its moral progress can be judged by the way its animals are treated' and I think we need to remember that. Again, I know your task is difficult and everyone is probably asking for an increase in funding or at least not to be cut and I also know that this increase does not come without a cost. I know that every dollar that we ask for is a dollar out of the taxpayer's pocket books of this county. I think those of you that know me know that I do not make this request lightly. I served on the Board of Directors for my fire department with Commissioner Satterfield and I think he will attest that I am one of the most frugal people around. I will squeeze a penny out of everything I can so I do take this very seriously. I would like to have all of the shelter's supporters to stand at this time that are interested in getting an increase for the shelter. That is all I have."

Commissioner Lucas stated "In looking at your budget because we had that in front of us, I see where there were thousands of dollars difference in depreciation, why is that? It went from \$7,000 to \$8,000 to \$6,000 to 2,000 and now there is nothing depreciated." Dr. Foster responded

“That unfortunately is probably something that I cannot answer. There are a few accounting irregularities in here again because we don’t have someone that is trained accounting wise and some of the things that have been inputted on our sheet are not inputted exactly right. One thing that I will show you and I discovered it after I put it out is it says last year June 30, 2011 the county submitted \$111,000 actually it was only \$100,000. We had \$11,000 in grants that were somehow coded wrong. There are a few little things in there that are wrong.” Commissioner Lucas continued “What is the landfill fee?” Dr. Foster responded “That is where they dispose of the animals.” Commissioner Lucas stated “I certainly don’t see why that \$560.39 cannot be waived. That deposal fee should be waived tonight.” Dr. Foster responded “Every penny counts.” Commissioner Lucas continued “That would be a \$561.00 savings right there. If you would like to have that in a form of a motion I am prepared to do that.” Chairman Hall responded “Let’s not do that tonight. Let’s discuss that as part of our budget process.” Commissioner Lucas stated “I would be in favor of having that changed immediately.”

Commissioner Carter stated “I am in favor first of all for saving the animals. I have two dogs of my own. I see Dr. Foster where you lost from last budget year had a loss of \$30,000 coming in instead of, I am looking at \$69,000 versus \$111,000 the year before.” Dr. Foster responded “That is, if you will look at the top, that is only goes through February, it is not the full year. I basically gave you the latest financial statement. The big thing I wanted to point out as far as our financial situation is we went from \$56,000 and as of February we only have \$19,000 and like I said \$9,000 of that is incumbent funds so we have less than \$10,000 in the operating budget. If things continued by this time next year we will be in the red and our only choice would be to cut the staff and the numbers. We have done everything we can to try to save on utilities. If we could save a dime we would try to save a dime because every penny counts.” Commissioner Carter continued “I would like to commend the Animal Protection Society for the adoption rate in Caswell County. They are less than Rockingham, Person and other counties around us. I think it is really commendable of Caswell County for them to be able to save that many pets. We really have something to be proud of.” Dr. Foster responded “It is 300 dogs too many and a bunch of cats too many but unfortunately I think the job that they do here is just outstanding and everybody that goes to that shelter talks about how clean it is, how it smells good, and the job that they are doing. It is definitely a shining star.”

Commissioner Satterfield asked “Dr. Foster I have two children who have adopted dogs from out there and they did say how nice it was and they were treated very nice by the staff during the adoption process. I have not seen anywhere on this sheet of paper that I have, how much money are we talking about, what type of increase are you talking about next year?” Dr. Foster responded “In our budget request we requested an additional \$30,000. Part of that is for some of the things I mentioned the Department of Agriculture has asked us to fix. We have quotes as far as the fencing to replace that is about \$2,500. To do the painting that needs to be done, the sanding and the painting of those doors is about \$9,000 is the quote we have. The cost to put the roof over the runs was about \$2500. That is a part of our request in addition to the \$10,000 we need just to continue to keep things even.”

Commissioner Lucas asked “How many fundraisers do you have a year?” Dr. Foster responded “We currently try to have one major fundraiser a year and then we have yard sales, 3 or 4 of those a year. Again it becomes one of those things where with a volunteer organization like all

volunteer organizations you get stretched thin. Fundraisers and donations are sort of down as with most of the economy. I also realized that this is a struggle that you all have. Again, I sympathize with you. I know it is a hard decision when you are looking at schools or dogs or medical personnel or human personnel issues and dogs. I think we have got to remember to be humanitarians and treat the animals the way they should be treated. \$500 a year may not sound like a lot but that is a lot and we are not asking for a lot I don't think."

Commissioner Carter asked "Is \$30,000 going to be the most you need or do you need \$10,000 more which would be \$40,000 all together?" Dr. Foster responded "\$30,000 total. That will give us the money to continue to operating and that would give us the funds to get the repairs done that the Department of Agriculture has asked us to do."

Chairman Hall stated "We will take all of this into consideration when we start our budget deliberations. It might be that we may ask you to come back when we start that process." Dr. Foster responded "I would enjoy the opportunity. Thank you a lot."

EMS WEEK PROCLAMATION

Mr. Barry Lynch stated "Good evening Commissioners, my request tonight is EMS week is May 20th through 26th. It is recognized across the nation to show respect and to honor EMS professionals. I am asking tonight for a proclamation for the county to observe EMS week for May 20th through the 26th."

Commissioner Lucas moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to accept the proclamation to observe EMS Week May 20th through the 26th. The motion carried unanimously.

Mr. Lynch stated "I would also like to extend an invitation on May 19th, Saturday, from 11:00 until 3:00 we will have an open house at the base. We will have vehicle extrication demonstrations, 2 community CPR classes that we will be having free of charge to the community and I would like to invite all of you to stop by if you have a chance. Thank you."

EMS Week Proclamation

To designate the Week of May 20-26, 2012, as Emergency Medical Services Week

WHEREAS, each year residents and visitors to Caswell County may require emergency medical care for traumatic injuries, burns, poisonings, spinal cord injuries, heart attacks, and other critical medical emergencies; and

WHEREAS, emergency medical services is a vital public service; and

WHEREAS, the members of emergency medical services teams are ready to provide lifesaving care to those in need 24 hours a day, seven days a week; and

WHEREAS, access to quality emergency care dramatically improves the survival and recovery rate of those who experience sudden illness or injury; and

WHEREAS, the emergency medical services system consists of emergency physicians, emergency nurses, emergency medical technicians, paramedics, firefighters, educators, administrators and others; and

WHEREAS, the members of emergency medical services teams, whether career or volunteer, engage in thousands of hours of specialized training and continuing education to enhance their lifesaving skills; and

WHEREAS, it is appropriate to recognize the value and the accomplishments of emergency medical services providers by designating Emergency Medical Services Week; now

THEREFORE, I, Nathaniel Hall, Chairman of the Caswell County Board of Commissioners, in recognition of this event do hereby proclaim the week of May 20-26, 2012, as

EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES WEEK

ADOPTED THIS THE 7th DAY OF MAY, 2012

S/Nathaniel Hall
Nathaniel Hall, Chairman
Caswell County Board of Commissioners

ATTEST:

S/Paula P. Seamster
Paula P. Seamster
Clerk to the Board

RFP RECOMMENDATION FOR COMMISSARY FOR DETENTION CENTER

Lt. Tony Durden recommended awarding the commissary contract to Swanson at a 26% commission rate, 7 kiosks – 1 in the lobby, 1 in booking and 5 in the dorms.

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to accept the Sheriff's office recommendation for Swanson for the commissary contract. The motion carried by a vote of six to one with Commissioner Lucas voting no.

RFP RECOMMENDATION FOR FOOD SERVICE FOR DETENTION CENTER

Lt. Tony Durden recommended awarding the food service contract to ABL Management.

Commissioner Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Williamson to accept the Sheriff's office recommendation for ABL Management for the food service contract. The motion carried by a vote of six to one with Commissioner Lucas voting no.

RRP RECOMMENDATION FOR INMATE HEALTH

Lt. Tony Durden recommended awarding the inmate health contract to Southern Health Partners.

Commissioner Carter moved, seconded by Commissioner Williamson to accept the Sheriff's office recommendation for Southern Health Partners for the inmate health contract. The motion carried by a vote of five to two with Commissioners Lucas and Satterfield voting no.

RFP FOR KITCHEN EQUIPMENT FOR DETENTION CENTER

Lt. Tony Durden recommended purchasing the kitchen equipment from Rapids Contract & Design in the amount of \$97,306.01.

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to accept the recommendation of the Sheriff's office to purchase the kitchen equipment from Rapids Contract & Design in the amount of \$97,306.01. The motion carried by a vote of six to one with Commissioner Lucas voting no.

Lt. Durden asked "After approving these RFPs for these services can we proceed with the contracts for the first three I gave you for food service, commissary and inmate health for review and approved for fiscal year 2012-13?" Chairman Hall responded "I would think so since we approved them. If your office would get those contracts to our general counsel we can proceed."

2012-2013 BUDGET

Chairman Hall stated that he wanted to get the Board's thoughts on employee raises. He wanted to instruct staff on how to proceed with the budget.

Commissioners Jefferies and Carter were in favor of giving the employees raises. Commissioner Lucas stated that she believed that every commissioner would like to give the county employees a raise but she felt it was premature to comment to that without seeing the budget figures. Commissioner Williamson stated that he would like for staff to give the commissioners their recommendation for raises. Chairman Hall responded by saying that the Board needed to direct staff on what numbers to budget for the raises. Commissioner Carter stated that he would like to see a 2% and a 3% raise. Commissioner Satterfield asked why staff could not put in the budget what each percent would cost. He added that he was not ready to make a commitment until he looked at the budget. Chairman Hall stated that he wanted to get the Board's input so that staff would have enough time to get that back to the Board so they would have time to make a decision.

Commissioner Lucas asked when the budget would be presented to the Board. Mr. Howard replied that the budget would be presented at the next commissioners meeting.

TENNIS COURT REPAIR CHANGE ORDER

Mr. Howard stated that at the last commissioners meeting the Board had requested an engineer to look at the tennis courts to see what needed to be done. SM&E recommended an 8" undercut which would cost \$18,900 and then filling it with stone.

Chairman Hall asked how many tennis courts did this space cover. Mr. Howard responded about two tennis courts. He added that his understanding from the school system is they need 6 courts in order to have meets there.

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to accept the recommendation of the county manager. The motion carried by a vote of five to two with Commissioners Lucas and Travis voting no.

RESOLUTION REQUESTING STATE APPROPRIATION FOR HAVA FUNDS

Mr. Howard stated that the Board had a letter and a resolution from the Elections Board Association of North Carolina requesting that all counties send in a resolution so that the state would provide the matching funds for the HAVA grants. These monies will offset our funds for the elections. There is no guarantee that the state will do this even if we send a resolution in.

Commissioner Satterfield asked how much the county had received this year from the HAVA funds. Mr. Howard responded none because the county does not receive the funds until after the elections. Commissioner Satterfield asked how much the county received last year. Mr. Howard responded about \$10,000 - \$15,000. Mr. Howard added that this money pays for the voting machines to be reprogrammed and set up for the elections.

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis to accept the recommendation of the county manager. The motion carried unanimously.

COUNTY MANAGER'S REPORT Detention Center Water/Sewer Update

Mr. Howard stated that the county has a preliminary approval of the water meter and back flow preventer and the set up for the fire suppression system from the Town's engineer. The Town's engineer has asked that we put some type of flow meter on the fire suppression system so that if the system was turned on we would know and they would know. The way the system is designed is when the pressure drops an alarm will sound. The county is finished up the information on the lift station and Mr. Howard will meet with the Town on the 16th to go over the final details of the lift station. He is hoping to have everything approved by the end of the month.

Commissioner Lucas asked if there was two different parts to this. Mr. Howard responded that the water system was a separate part from the lift station. Commissioner Lucas asked if this was in the budget from the beginning. Mr. Howard responded that the lift station was not in the original budget.

TOWN OF YANCEYVILLE/TOWN OF MILTON ISSUES

Chairman Hall stated that he wanted to list these items on the agenda but they would be discussed at the next commissioners meeting. He asked that the clerk have these items on the agenda for the next commissioners meeting. These items were raised during the joint meeting.

- A. Town of Yanceyville/Town of Milton Meeting in July Dates
- B. Inter-local Agreements
- C. Yanceyville Municipal Parking Lot Lease
- D. Code Enforcement Agreement

Chairman Hall asked the Board if they had other items to add to make sure to get them to the clerk before the next meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND UPCOMING EVENTS

- A. Person-Caswell Lake Authority Cook Out – May 17, 2012
6:00 p.m. Social 7:00 p.m. Dinner
- B. NCACC County Assembly Day – May 30, 2012
- C. NACo Annual Conference in Pittsburgh – July 13-17, 2012
- D. NCACC Annual Conference at Raleigh Convention Center – August 16 – 19, 2012

Commissioner Lucas asked if she could schedule a special meeting for the Dan River Reclassification. It is her understanding that the Dan River reclassification will be discussed during the short session of the General Assembly. There is a 10 or 12 day limit to introduce local legislation and to have action taken on it. She added that there was a public hearing held in 2011 and the citizens successfully make an appeal to DENR to appeal it to the legislature to reconsider or review the reclassification.

Commissioner Carter asked what Commissioner Lucas wanted to classify it as. Commissioner Lucas responded that she was concerned about the request that was sent to DENR requesting to look at it closely or to review it with the legislature. Mr. Howard explained that a public hearing was held. DENR received enough comments that their board would not approve the reclassification on an administrative level. It was referred to the legislature and they will have to vote on it in session for it to be adopted. He added that his understanding was that it would be reclassified as a level IV which is the least restricted.

Commissioner Carter asked who did not want this reclassification. Mr. Howard responded the citizens in that area. Commissioner Lucas stated that she did not know how many responses they received. Mr. Howard replied that they had to have at least ten.

Chairman Hall suggested that each commissioner contact the clerk with 3 dates to have this meeting no later than tomorrow.

Commissioner Carter stated that he would like for the county manager to add what was discussed by the ASPCA tonight in the budget. Mr. Howard responded that it was in their request and will be in the budget information.

Mr. Howard asked the Board to let staff know if they would be attending the Person-Caswell Lake Authority cookout and County Assembly Day on May 30th.

CLOSED SESSION

Commissioner Jefferies moved, seconded by Commissioner Travis that the Board enter into Closed Session to discuss matters relating to economic development (NCGS 143-318.11(a)(4)) and to consider the compensation, terms of appointment and performance of an individual public officer (NCGS 143-318.11(a)(6)). The motion carried unanimously.

REGULAR SESSION

Commissioner Satterfield moved, seconded by Commissioner Carter to resume regular session. The motion carried unanimously.

ADJOURNMENT

At 9:40 p.m. Commissioner Travis moved, seconded by Commissioner Jefferies to adjourn. The motion carried unanimously.

Paula P. Seamster
Clerk to the Board

Nathaniel Hall
Chairman
